

113.

THE

Cromwelian Ghost conjur'd, &c.

And put from creeping into Houses, &c.

O R

EPAPHRODITUS and *EPAPHRAS*;

Called to a new Conference,

I N

Vindication of the Author of the *Snake, &c.*
from these Errors charged upon him in a
Letter to a Gentleman, &c.

TO WHICH,

Some plain Queries to the last Publisher of
The Marrow of Modern Divinity, are subjoined.

*Nehem. 6. 8 There are no such things as thou sayest;
but thou feignest them out of thine own Heart.*

*Tam litigiosas excitant questiones, ut nisi quod ipsi faci-
unt, nihil rectum existimant, August. Epist. 118 ad
Januarium.*

*Ut mihi sepe
Bilem; sepe focos vestri movere Tumultus?*
Horat. Epist. 19. Lib. 1.

EDINBURGH,

Printed for the Author, Anno DOM. 1720.



Epaphroditus and Epaphras,

Called to a new Conference,

I N

Vindication of the Author of
the *Snake*, &c.

Epaphrod.

Good Morrow to you,
Brother *Epaphras*,
I am glad to see
you again in good
Health, after our late Rancounter with
the *Principal*. I think we are like to have
a Hackney Trade of it for some Time.

Epabr. There's no Help for that, Bro-
ther, while we are in Mens Hands, who
love to wrangle and raise Dust; but I
should reckon no Piece of Drudgery se-
vere

A 2

vere upon me, if I could preserve the Peace of the Church by it.

Epaphrod. You speak like your self, Sir, and as you was in use of doing in the first Age of Christianity. But in earnest, what do you think moved our late Master to press us so keenly into his Service.

Epaphr. I do not indeed understand the Philosophy of this; unless it was to terrify and fright the honest *Principal* by our Names and Character; for (whatever Accounts we were obliged to make of him in our late Conference) one of his Reading could not miss to know, that we were ancient Officers of the Christian Church. And tho' we never had Pretensions to extraordinary Divine Inspiration, or Infallibility; yet we lived under the immediate Inspection of such who had it, and frequently conversed with Inspired Apostolick Men: So that our Decisions in Matters of Controversy, must be next to the Thing ye call *Infallible*, and to impugn these, must be horrid ill Manners.

Epaphrod. But don't you think, Brother, our Master might have as easily served

ved himself nearer Home with Arbitrators, as to have been at the Expence of bringing us from *Rome*, where we were much better employed.

Epaphr. I do not doubt but he might have got some few in his own Neighbourhood of either Sexes, that would have served his Turn; but then they had no great Pretensions to Infallibility: And besides, if they had used the same Freedom with the *Principal* and the received Doctrine of the Church of *Scotland*, that we have done, they might have been brought under vexatious Suits before Church Judicatories, which we are happily secured against.

Epaphrod. But do you mind, Sir, the Equipage we were put in, when we sallied out against the *Principal*.

Epaphr. O yes, I mind it exactly. Our provident Master told us, *He had purchased the Principal's Sermon, That he had the Marrow and Marshal at hand, and that nothing besides would be needful for managing the Conference, Page 4.*

Epaphrod. But don't you think, that it had been decent, at least, to have carried

ried a Bible along with us, especially when we are all three Church-men; and the Subject we were to attack the *Principal* upon, was an Article of Faith.

Epaphr. I cannot well refuse this; but yet I see a visible Inconveniency that might have happened upon our doing so, viz. That, if that Text of holy Writ had cast up, *Acts 16. 31. Believe in the Lord Jesus and ye shall be saved*, with the Explication of it in the *Marrow*, we had all gone into Muirburn.

Epaprod. You are certainly under the Effects of Melancholy, Brother; for our Master has a sufficient *salvo* against that Explication, in a small Piece of Artillery, which he carries about by way of Reserve, called, *The Explication of Passages excepted against in the Marrow*; with which he works Wonders, tho' those who have seen it, say, 'Tis a Piece of as weak Armour as is any where extant.

Epaphr. However, I am glad, that with our Tools, such as they are, we have sufficiently mortified the *Principal*, and brought him in ignorant, or mistaken, upon every Part of the Controversy; so, that

that if he shall happen to succeed to the next inferior Vacancy in the College, I think he may be very thankful, which our Master seems to homologate by giving him the Title of *Professor*, by way of Anticipation.

Epaphrod. Was you not expecting, Brother, after this Heroick Performance, in demolishing one of the eminent Lights of the Church, that we should have been dismissed handsomly, and got Thanks for our good Service.

Epaphr. I was indeed. But I now begin to fear, lest our Master detain us for Term and Life, as the Coalliers are kept in the Country where he lives: And I heartily wish we be not obliged to work in Darknels, as they for ordinary do.

Epaphrod. You have certainly reason to imagine, you will not be soon discharged of your Service. For, I mind after the Conference with the *Principal* was ended, our Master told us by way of Postscript, that he intends, when he has more Leisure, to consider the Author of the *Snake &c.*

Epaphr. That little Author then must

must not think to shelter himself under the common Saying; *Aquila non capiat muscas*. But, must needs stand his Trial as well as his Betters have done before him.

Epaphrod. I'm mightily afraid if he come in our Master's Hands, he'll squeeze him to the Bone; and that he will not be able to stand before that vast Train of Demonstrations he has in readiness to prove his Print to be dangerous and erroneous.

Epaphr. That's but a big Way of speaking, And I should think the Author of the *Snake*, may be very easy. For, tho' our Master has advertised him, that he doubts not to demonstrate, that his Print is not free of gross and dangerous Errors, yet at the same Time, He very wisely, and consistently tells him, It contains nothing of Difficulty, which is not cleared in the *Explication of Passages*, &c.

Epaphrod. One indeed would think this tolerable good Security among common Writers, but it would not do with those of the refined Sort, who understand the nice Art of demonstrating upon every *Punctilio*, and that our Master, has a singular

gular Faculty, this way, especially since his late Acquaintance with the renowned Mr. *Marshal*, is obvious to all.

Epaphr. I begin then to pity the poor *Snake* and its unhappy Author; and if it were possible to get out of our Master's Reach, for some Hours, I would incline mightily to help them at a dead Lift.

Epaphrod. The Resolution is both charitable and gentlemanly, and I heartily go in with it, and the rather, that I understand, what the Author of the *Snake*, wants in Reading and Argument, he'll make up to us in Diversion: But I hope all of us shall keep within just Bounds, when we come to treat of grave and serious Subjects, whatever innocent freedom we may use on other Occasions.

Epaphr. All Hands to work then; and let us see what we can do for a Friend at a Pinch.

Epaphrod. Have you read, Brother, a Letter to a Gentleman containing a Detection of Errors in a Print, Entituled, *The Snake in the Grass, &c.*

Epaphr. I have, with all the Application I am Master of.

B

Epaphrod.

Epaphrod. How like you the Title on't.

Epaphr. I have been always very easy, about the Inscriptions or Titles of Books, seeing these are no other Evidences of good Entertainment, than the ordinary Signs affixt to publick Houses, are: However, considering the vast Number of Letters and circular Missives, our late Master has already blest the World with, and directed to Gentlemen, I thought, Gratitude or Interest would have obliged him, to favour some of the Female Sex with this.

Epaphrod. Let the Ladies and him dispute that betwixt them; our Business certainly is, to try our Skill in clearing the Author of the *Snake*, from invidious Sarcasms, Mistakes in History, vilifying our Reformers, and other Pieces of ill Manners and Heterodoxy, he is charged with.

Epaphr. The first Thing I mind, the *Prefacer* to the *Marrow* (for so our late Master styles himself) quarrels in the *Snake*, is, That the Author of that Paper has misapplied, the Text prefixt to it, 2 *Tim.* 3. 6. *For of this Sort are they who creep into houses and lead captive, silly Women*

Women &c. Now, supposing that to be true, I don't believe the *Prefacer* can altogether clear himself from the like Guilt in other Cases which should certainly make him the more easy in this. 2^{do}, I maintain, that the Author of the *Snake* is absolutely innocent according to the *Prefacer's* own Principle, in the Explication of *Passages &c.* Page 4, where he says (speaking of the *Marrow*) *That they who pass harsh Censures upon it, ought to deal more fairly, than to load the Author with such Expressions as he quoted from Divines of great Note.* Now if this be good Sense, can any Body be justly blamed for quoting an Expression inspired by the Spirit of GOD, especially if you consider what follows. *Ibid.* *That the Author of the Marrow, is not exceptionable, unless he could be challenged, for unfair Citation, whereof I am sure (says the Prefacer) he is not, or is not willingly guilty.* Now, I believe none will say, that Text prefixt to the *Snake*, is unfairly cited; and therefore the Author, according to the *Prefacer's* own Way of reasoning, cannot be blamed for it. But 3^{tio}, What if there

be a *fama clamosa* in the Case, anent creeping into Houses &c. Who is liable then, the *Snake*, or the *Fama*? Let the Form of Process decide that; and I'm perswaded, upon an Enquiry, the *Snake* will be assoillied; as not being hatched, or in the Grass sleeping, when this *Fama* was first raised. 4to, I observe something, like the Thing we call unfair Dealing here, the Author of the *Snake*, precisely cited these Words, *For, of this Sort are they who creep into Houses, and lead captive, silly women, and stopt here for preventing Offence, and ill Blood.* But, the *Prefacer* to the *Marrow*, at his own Hand, has added the last Part of the Verse: *Laden with Sins, led away with diverse lusts,* which cannot miss to be galling to some of the Female Sex.

Epaphrod. He has visibly done so; and you may depend on't, he could have no other View, but to incense honest and well meaning Women against us.

Epaphr. I am afraid the Stratagem take, and that we be disgracefully turned out of our Quarters in the *W----T B-----W* of *Edinburgh* where we have hitherto

hitherto been very civilly and discreetly
uled.

Epaphrod. We must take our Hazard
now, Brother, for this Campaign, tho' we
should be obliged to lodge with the
Snake in the Grass.

Epaphr. I am credibly informed, the
Prefacer to the *Marrow*, in his Papers he
sent to *Edinburgh*, complained at large,
of some very bitter, and invective In-
sinuations in the Preface to the *Snake*.
And tho' the, R-----B who revised the
Performance, has thought fit to expunge
the Particulars, and to wrap them up
in Generals; yet no doubt they still lay
heavy upon our old Master's Stomach,
which cannot be supposed to digest
things so easily now, as it would have
done some Years ago.

Epaphrod. Are these Reflections per-
sonal?

Epaphr. No indeed, they are not; ex-
cept in so far as the *Prefacer* is visibly em-
barqued in a Project for dividing and in-
flaming his Mother-Church; and in this
Case, I think a Man can hardly exceed in
the Matter of Resentment.

Epaphrod.

Epaphrod. This is yet worse than any thing of this kind in the *Snake*. The *Prefacer* tells us, he thought fit to publish the *Marrow*, as an *Essay* to demolish *Antichrist*, and diffuse Evangelical Light. Now after such pious Views, to reckon him a Disturber of the Peace, seems really invidious.

Epaphr. But is *Antichrist*, formerly attack't in the Book?

Epaphrod. There's not one Word of him (as far as I mind), from the Beginning to the End of it; so that the *Man of Sin*, is in no more Danger by this *Essay*, than he is by some of the *Prefacer's* own Works.

Epaphr. Has the *Prefacer* then reacht his End in this respect?

Epaphrod. Not that I can see; unless he has taken the *Principal*, for *Antichrist*, whom indeed we have humbled to purpose.

Epaphr. But does not this Book answer the other End of it, viz. the Diffusing of Evangelical Light.

Epaphrod. To a Wonder! If only by Evangelical Light you understand the Do-

Doctrine of the new Scheme, of which this Book seems to be the Standart: And for my own Part, I could never as yet see a good Reason for its last Edition, if it was not to give Reputation to the *Aucht---r Creed*.

Epaphr. I believe you may be in the Right on't; and it seems this is that which makes some Ministers at their Diets of Examination, ask their Parishoners, if they have the *Marrow*, and to recommend the getting of it to those who want it.

Epaphrod. There's no doubt of it, but I should think it would become them as well to recommend the *Confession of Faith, Larger and shorter Catechisms*.

Epaphr. Alas for't! These are like to go into Desuetude with many; and the *Marrow*, to my certain Knowledge, is put into several Peoples Hands, as containing a more clear Discovery of Gospel-Truth, than they.

Epaphrod. I am not at all surpris'd at this Piece of Management, seeing I defy any Man of common Sense to read the Preface to the *Marrow*, but he must be perswaded that the Publisher designed it,
as

as an Improvement upon the received Doctrine of the Church.

Epaphr. But to go on, Is it possible; think ye to clear the Author of the *Snake*, from Mistakes in point of History, and from vilifying the Persons and Writings of our Reformers?

Epaphrod. I think it very easy; for the *Prefacer* himself, after advancing this general Charge, Page 1, is so very kind, as deliberately to pass from it, reckoning the Publick, little, if at all, concerned about it.

Epaphr. There seems to be something of good Nature here: But was this a good Reason for his not condescending upon Particulars?

Epaphrod. It had not the least Shew of it: And I must say that some of his extemporary Thoughts elsewhere are better than his deliberate Thoughts here are: For 'tis obvious to any Man of common Sense, that the Publick are more concerned in Matters of History, the Persons and Writings of our Reformers, than in several Things which are in Debate betwixt him and us. With respect to History

story, Mistakes here must necessarily oblige People to form wrong Notions of Men and Things, and to transmit these to Posterity: And what Kind of a Protestant, think ye, would he make, who could tamely hear the Persons and Writings of those exposed, who were the blessed Instruments of reforming that Religion, he expects Heaven and eternal Life by.

Epapbr. But in good Earnest, is there any Thing of History in the *Snake*?

Epaphrod. There's no bit of it, so far as I mind, from the Beginning to the End, except the Date of the *Marrow*, Pag. 21. which is said to have been done in *Cromwel's* Time, about the Year 1645, as is presumable from Mr. *Caryl's* Licence to it, dated May 1645, and the Date of our *Confession of Faith*, which began to be compiled in the Year 1643, as the Ordinance of the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament distinctly bears.

Epapbr. I think these are no great Mistakes in Point of History. And if we had the same Evidence, that the Thing ye call *New Schism*, came from the Apostolick

Epaphr. I doubt not but we shall do that in due Time: For in the general, I dare say, if the Author of the *Snake* has advanced any Thing of Heterodoxy in his Paper, it has been done with an Orthodox Mind: And more for want of Reading, than for want of Love to Truth.

Epaphrod. I am afraid you homologate that Jesuitical Maxim, viz. *The Intention specifies the Action*: And that the *Prefacer* in his next Performance make a Handle of this, to bring in the Author of the *Snake*, as a convict *Papist*.

Epaphr. He seems to be in no Danger this Way; for his Want of Merit, as the *Prefacer* very justly observes, will certainly secure him against that Charge.

Epaphrod. I think 'tis now high Time, we take up our selves, and put on these *Airs* we wore in the first Age of Christianity; at least, till we have gone into a Detail of the *Prefacer's* Letter to his Gentleman.

Epaphr. I am entirely of your Mind; and tho' we have hitherto had *Seria mixta jocis*: Yet I must say, that I never admired this Way of doing Things, in Matters of
Religi-

Religion: And therefore let us now ply our Work with that Seriousness and Gravity, the Subjects we are to treat of, require.

Epaphrod. You mind, Sir, the first Thing the Author of the *Snake* taxeth, Page 7th, is in the Author of the *Marrow* his Epistle to the Reader, Page 3d, the Words are, *Is it not ordinary, when the LORD convinceth a Man of his Sins, to cry after this manner, O I am a sinful Man! for I have lived a very wicked Life, and therefore surely, the LORD is angry with me, and will damn me in Hell. O what shall I do to save my Soul! And is there not at Hand some ignorant miserable Comforter ready to say, Yet do not despair, Man; but repent of thy Sins, and ask GOD Forgiveness, and reform your Life, and doubt not but he will be merciful unto you; for he has promised, at what Time soever a Sinner repents of his Sins, he will forgive him, &c.* Upon which, by way of Remark, the Author of the *Snake* says, *For my Part, I never heard the Doctrine of Repentance and Reformation mock'd in such a grave and serious manner,*

manner, to represent a Man of a very wicked and lewd Life, and yet to insinuate, That his Minister must not so much as bid him repent, ask GOD Forgiveness, or reform his Life, seems to be modern Divinity indeed. In short, this Man, as the Author represents him, has either a due Sense of his Sins, or not. If he has, then I think, whoever deals with his Conscience, should set before him, the Freeness and Fulness of GOD's Grace, the Sufficiency of CHRIST's Righteousness, and the gracious Offers of Mercy in the Gospel, to all penitent believing Sinners; but if he was never duly burden'd, and broken with a Sense of his Sin, which I am apprehensive he never was, since, after the different Parts the Author makes him act, he leaves him a formal hypocritical Professor. I say, in this Case, an honest Minister could hardly miss to press upon him the Doctrine of Repentance. And to support this Opinion, I think I have very good Authority, vide Directory, Page 461. If it appears he hath not a due Sense of his Sins, Endeavours ought to be used to convince him of his Sins, of the Guilt and Defect

Defect of them, of the Filth and Pollution the Soul contracts by them, and of the Curse of the Law, and the Wrath of GOD due to them; that he may be truly affected with, and humbled for them: And withall, to make known the Danger of deferring Repentance, &c.

Epaphr. I am very much of the Mind this Remark is both just and orthodox; and I wish all the rest may be as well guarded, and then, I hope, we shall get easily over them.

Epaphrod. But you must know, Brother that the Author of the Marrow speaketh here concerning a Person who is convinced, and moveth intirely in the Sphere of the Covenant of Works, as the Prefacer tells us, Page 5th of his Letter.

Epaphr. I heartily wish he be not made a convinced Person, by the same Art the Principal's Man was made a Believer: For I must say, I never heard a duly convinced Sinner talk at the Rate he does. If the LORD will but spare my Life, says he, I will become a new Man, &c. and all the while, being ignorant of the Righteousness of CHRIST, he goes about to establish

establish his own. *Nay, saysthe Prefacer
 himself, He is much like Israel of old,
 that promised so very liberally, Exod. 19.
 8. All that the LORD hath spoken we
 will do. Or like that Debitor, Mat. 18.
 26. Have Patience with me, and I will
 pay thee all. Now, I appeal to the Sense
 and Experience of all exercised Christians,
 if this be the genuine Language of a con-
 vinced Soul. Or rather, does he not ex-
 press himself, as the poor *Publican* does,
*Luke 18. 13. Who stood afar off, and
 would not lift up so much as his Eyes to
 Heaven, but smote upon his Breast, and
 said, GOD be merciful to me a Sinner.*
 Or, as *Peter's Hearers* did, *Acts 2. 37.*
 who being pricked in their Hearts, said
 unto *Peter*, and the rest of the Apostles,
Men and Brethren, what shall we do?
 To whom the Apostle answers, *v. 38. Re-
 pent and be baptized, every one of you in
 the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of
 Sins.* So that there seems to be no great
 Heresie in preaching the Doctrine of Re-
 pentance unto Sinners, whether they be
 duly convinced of their Sins, or not. The
 Apostle *Peter* does it in the first Case, and
 the*

the Church orders all her Ministers to do it in the last, as you plainly see by the above Citation, from our *Directory*: And yet I hope none will be so bold as to say, That either of them are ignorant or miserable Comforters. In a Word, I heartily go in with what the Reverend Mr. *Webster* says in the Preface to his Sermons, Page 2d, near the Middle. O sweet Word! Christ is the End of the Law for Righteousness, to every one that believeth; and the Law is a School-master, that leadeth unto Christ, yea, almost lasheth some to Death, before they be driven to him. (but it does not appear that this Man has been so much as whipt by it) Let Ministers enter into Christ's Measures, and preach the Curses of the Law against unconverted Sinners, and then offer Christ and his Covenant to be embraced by them, and they shall observe more Success than they can expect from Rhetorical Discourses interlarded with nice Criticisms, Subtilties from School-men, Sentences from Pagan Moralists, or Christian Fathers: And tho' be had added New Schemes of Doctrine, I should have homologate all together.

D

Epaphrod.

Epaphrod. How like you the second Note of the Letter, Page 5th, *Viz.* *This is what our Antagonist calleth, A mocking of Repentance and Reformation. He must then be a true Penitent, in the Account of our Antagonist, and that must be Reformation of Life, which the convinced Person spinneeth (as it were) out of his own Bowels.*

Epaphr. I declare ingenuously, I don't see the Foundation of this Note: For it is obvious to any Man of common Sense, who reads the *Snake*, that it is not a Man's being convinc'd, and moving intirely in the Sphere of the Covenant of Works, that is called, *A mocking of the Doctrine of Repentance and Reformation*, as the Prefacer would have it: But a Man's being represented of a very wicked and lewd Life (whether he be convinced or not) and at the same Time, Insinuations made to him, that he is not obliged to repent, ask GOD Forgiveness, or reform his Life. Now, after this, and what the Author of the *Snake* says in his Remark, *viz.* *That he's apprehensive, this Man was never duly burdened nor broken with a Sense of Sin;* yet

yet t
niten
of F
own
fair I
and i
one
will
Ep
Auth
posin
his S
his u
let u
Orth
Ep
on't,
Chur
print
who
Sin,
Consc
Fuln
Righ
in the
lieve
throu

yet to alledge, *That he must be a true Penitent in his Account, spinning out the Work of Reformation (as it were) out of his own Bowels,* seems not to be so very fair Reasoning, to give it no worse Name, and is a Consequence that no Man, but one of the *Prefacer's* own Penetration, will see.

Epaphrod. I fancy, the Direction the Author of the *Snake* gives (upon his supposing this Man to have a true Sense of his Sin) has brought the *Prefacer* into his uncharitable Mistake; and therefore let us inquire into the Reasonableness and Orthodoxy of that Advice.

Epaphr. The Advice, you may depend on't, is precisely the same, which the Church, in our *Directory*, Page 461, printed *Edinburgh*, 1708, orders for those who are broken in Spirit with the Sense of Sin, viz. *That whoever deal with their Consciences, set before them the Freeness and Fulness of GOD's Grace, the Sufficiency of Righteousness in Christ, the gracious Offers in the Gospel, that all who repent and believe with all their Heart in GOD's Mercy, through Christ, renouncing their own Righteousness,*

zealousness, shall have Life and Salvation in him. Now, in stead of this last Sentence, (for Brevity's Sake) the Author of the Snake put in, *To all penitent believing Sinners*: And that he has not mistaken the Meaning of the Church, appears not only from the Sentence it self, as it stands full in the *Directory*, but likewise from what follows in the next Paragraph save one, viz. *Care also must be taken, that the sick Person be not cast down into Despair, by such a severe Representation of the Wrath of GOD due to him for his Sins, as is not mollified by a seasonable propounding of Christ and his Merit, for a Door of Hope to every penitent Believer.* This is the Doctrine, the Prefacer to the Marrow is so angry at, Letter Page 6th, and makes his N. B. upon, as being very unsuitable for the designed Effect. This Doctrine, he thinks, can give no Relief to the disconsolate Sinner: Nay, says he, *t's out of the Gospel Road, it does not send the Sinner to the Gospel-Market; for that's a Market without Money or Price: But this is one of another Nature; the Offers of Mercy here presupposeth a gracious State being made to the Penitent*

Penitent and Believer, who must needs be in the State of Grace already : Is this to preach the Gospel, Orthodoxy ? &c.

Epaphrod. I fear the *Snake* has catched our old Master here napping upon some of his Missives; For 'tis not imaginable that one of his Conduct, would have used so much Freedom with the known, received, sworn and subscribed Doctrine of the Church, if he had been duly apprised of it. But when upon due Thought, he shall reconcile his Inferences, from this Part of the *Remark*, with the Doctrine of the *Directory* (which certainly concerns him very much to do) I shall converse him (if he please) upon the Extent of Gospel-Offers.

Epaphr. I think, by all I have heard, this *Remark* seems to be a Collection, and they who pass harsh Censures upon it, ought to deal more fairly, than to load the Author with such Expressions, as he quoted from Divines of great Note; for assuredly our Author is not exceptionable here, unless he could be challenged for unfair Citation, whereof I am sure he is not, or is not willingly guilty.

Epaphrod.

Epaphrod. This I mind, in so many Words is the great Apology, made by the *Prefacer*, in Favours of the Author of the *Marrow*, *Explication of Passages*, Pag. 4. And if it take, with Respect to him, 'tis impossible it can misgive with Respect to the Author of the *Snake*, as to this Remark.

Epaphr. Upon the Whole, I am still of the Mind, That to represent a Man of a very wicked and lewd Life, and yet to insinuate, that his Minister must not so much as bid him repent, ask GOD Forgiveness, or reform his Life; it is not only a mocking of the Doctrine of Repentance and Reformation; but likewise a plain mocking of the laudable Practice, and Discipline of the Church, with respect to Delinquents; and says upon the Matter, That all our publick Seats, and Places of Repentance should be thrown down, as taking up Room in our Churches to no Purpose.

Epaphrod. So much for the first Remark in the *Snake*: Our next Work of course is to see, if we can bring the Author of that

that Paper from the detestable Herd of Socinians.

Epaphr. If he be reclaimable, this must certainly be a very charitable and good Office done him. But how in all the World, comes he to be classed with those vile Hereticks?

Epaphrod. Because, as the *Prefacer* tells us, Pag. 8. The representing the Covenant of Redemption, as a Covenant of Works, is new to him; and he always look'd upon the Covenant of Redemption, to have more of Affinity to the Covenant of Grace (tho' says he, they likewise differ) than to that of Works; and took it to be GOD's gracious and eternal Provision, for the Salvation of an Elect World, through a Mediator, upon the View of Adam's breaking the Covenant of Works.

Epaphr. I am credibly informed, that the Reverend Mr. *James Hog* Minister of the Gospel at *Carnock*, maintains the very same Doctrine, in one of his *Manuels*, which I am in quest of: But whether he first finds the Book called a *Definition of Faith*, or I, this *Missive*, Time must determine.

Epaphrod.

Epaphrod. I shall not say, but the Reverend Mr. Hog some ten or twelve Years ago, might have been of this Mind; but I am sure the *Prefacer* to the *Marrow*, is of a quite different Opinion, and reckons this Doctrine downright *Socinian*.

Epaphr. But does he advance Arguments, for supporting this heavy Charge?

Epaphrod. O yes, in Abundance. As *First*, This is no singular Notion in the Author of the *Marrow*, to call the Covenant of Redemption a Covenant of Works, who quotes *Reynolds*, *Ainsworth*, *Goodwin*, *Hooker*, and *Ball* on the Covenant, as may be seen in the Citation at the Foot of Pages 26. 27, 28, 29.

Epaphr. I must here tell you a Secret, Brother, *viz.* That the Author of the *Snake* has not one Book in his Custody cited by the Author of the *Marrow*, which is a visible Disadvantage to him just now. For some Men have a Way of picking up Sentences, out of Books, without any Regard to Connexion, or the Author's Scope, and make these their Sentiments; whereas, upon a full and impartial View of their Writings, they are found to be of a quite different Mind.

Epa-

Epaphrod. But this does not seem to be the Case here; for the *Prefacer* to the *Marrow* says, Note 2d. *The Doctrine taxed by our Antagonist, is just the known and received Doctrine of the blessed Company of godly and sound Divines, in Opposition to the detestable Herd of Socinians.*

Epaphr. This is a manifest Mistake; for all the sound Divines I ever read on this Subject, maintain the Covenant of Redemption to be the Foundation of the Covenant of Grace; and indeed so it is: For by this wonderful Transaction all the Causes of Man's Salvation are adjusted and secured: All Satisfaction, and Merit on Christ's Part undertaken, and Provision made that the Elect in due Time shall be called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by the mighty Power of GOD through Faith unto Salvation. Now, if this be Orthodox Divinity (as I fancy it is) there must certainly be the same Affinity and Relation betwixt the Covenant of Redemption, and that of Grace, that there is betwixt a Foundation, and the Superstructure, and consequently I cannot

E

justly

justly conceive of GOD's eternal Purpose of sending Christ, to deliver fallen Mankind, as the same Covenant of Works made with *Adam*, which the Author of the *Marrow*, and his *Prefacer* would have me do. Besides, the *Prefacer* and I both know a godly and sound Divine yet alive, who goes a greater Length this Way, than the Author of the *Snake* does, without the least Imputation of *Socinianism*, viz. The Reverend Mr. *James Webster*; who in his Sermons upon *Psal.* 36. 7, 8. Pag. 107. says, *The first Effect of this Love is, a Covenant of Redemption, a Transaction between the Prince and Priest upon the Throne; and in the Agreement be required, that the Traitor should be redeemed, and his Happiness retrieved, and that he should not only be a pardoned Rebel, but a Minister of State, and to go share of this Throne; the Council of Peace was betwixt the two for this.* 2dly, *The second Effect of this Love is, the Covenant of Grace, which is a Copy and Transcript of the Covenant of Redemption, &c.* Now that these were his deliberate Thoughts, appears from Pag. 42 to Pag. 45. and frequently thro' the

the rest of his Sermons. So that if there be any Thing of *Socinianism* here, this Reverend Divine has been much longer in the Transgression, than the Author of the *Snake*; and it concerns him the more to look to himself, that he wrestle out from among the vilest Herd of Hereticks.

Epaphrod. But how think you will the Author of the *Snake* answer the Question, Pag. 9. *Whether the Covenant of Redemption (or Council of Peace) beareth the second Person of the Trinity his undertaking to fulfil the Law, and satisfy offended Justice, yea or not?*

Epaphr. I think this very grave and solemn Question pretty clearly answered in the Remark it self, Pag. 11. of *Snake*, where 'tis said, *Our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the Fulness of Time assumed our human Nature, suffered a Tract of Miseries through his Life, and at length a shameful and painful Death in our Room and Stead: But then he was under no Necessity to undergo this wonderful Degradation, prior to his own Engagements; No, no, Love, eternal and unchangeable Love was at the Bottom of all. So that*

the undertaking to fulfil the Law, and satisfy Divine Justice, must have been made when the Covenant of Redemption was gone into. Now after this, I appeal unto every candid Reader, if it look't like fair Dealing, to insinuate to the World, that the Author of the *Snake* refused Christ's Substitution, in the Room of Elect Sinners, and thus to bring him under the Suspicion of *Socinianism*.

Epaphrod. Let us have nothing of Relentment on this Head; for 'tis plain the Author of the *Snake* asserts that Christ in the Covenant of Redemption, did undertake to fulfil the Law, and satisfy offended Justice: But yet at the same Time, he sees so much surprizing Love in God the Father's admitting of a Surety; and such unparalleled Love, in the Son's accepting of the Office; nay, so much Mercy and Compassion to miserable Sinners in the very first Sound of these Words, *a Covenant of Redemption*, that he cannot easily conceive of this wonderful Transaction, as a Covenant of Works; but must be very much of Mr. *Webster's* Mind, Sermon 5th, Pag. 49. where speaking of Christ as Mediator,

Mediator, he brings him in, telling the Father, *Not to stand upon the Rigour of Justice. Let rather, says he, the Covenant of Works go, and allow a Surrogate, allow a Substitute: Let a new Bargain come, and it will do the Business, &c.*

Epaphr. So much (at present) by way of wrestling out from among the vile and detestable Herd of *Socinians*. We come next to consider the 3d Observation in the *Letter*, Page 12th, anent two opposite Covenants, standing in Force at the same Time: And I am hopeful we shall do our Work here, without any thing like wrestling at all. For a plain Account of the Story, without much Reasoning upon it, will convince every Reader, that the Author of the *Snake* is egregiously misrepresented upon this Head.

Epaphrod. If you please, Brother, I'll deduce the Story, which will be no great Hardship upon me. The Author of the *Snake*, Pag. 16, 17, 18. makes it appear (even to the *Prefacer's* own Conviction) that the Author of the *Marrow* speaks not so cautiously as he ought, Page 40, 41, 42, where he makes the Ten Com-
mands

mands delivered to the *Jews* on Mount *Sinai*, a Covenant of Works, in its most strict and rigid Demands. He makes it plain likewise, that this Author is inconsistent with himself, having formerly, Page 19, asserted, That the Covenant of Works was noway capable of Renovation, after the Fall of *Adam*; yet the Author of the *Snake* is pleased to find him, in the Progreſs of his Book, returning to the Othodox Faith, by ſaying, Page 47. *GOD never made the Covenant of Works with any Man ſince the Fall, either with Expectation that he ſhould fulfill it, or to give him Life by it; but (Page 49) it was added, By way of Subſerviency, and Attendance, the better to advance, and make effectual the Covenant of Grace, and to convince the Jews of their Impotency, and ſo to drive them unto Chriſt, &c.* Upon which follow the Expreſſions ſo much quarrelled in the *Snake*, Page 19; yet, for all he ſays here, or upon this whole Subject, 'tis plain from the forecited Pages, that in Fact there were two oppoſite Covenants ſtanding in Force at the ſame Time; and how inconsistent this is with the

the
M
to
nar
the
Rig
mo
ma
this
ent
per
ther
the
an
that
Jew
to
the
If th
vena
have
Cov
ſame
ſame
made
Cove
at Sin

the Wisdom and Goodness of GOD, let any Man judge. And the more Pains he is at, to show that the Design of the *Sinai* Covenant was to humble the *Jews*, and to bring them to CHRIST, the End of the Law for Righteousness to them who believe, the more evidently he confutes himself, and makes it plain to a Demonstration, That this was not a Covenant of Works, which entails Happiness only, upon a Man's own perfect and personal Obedience. Now, there's nothing more obvious, than that the Author of the *Snake* designed this as an Argument (such as it is) to prove, that the Ten Commands delivered to the *Jews* at Mount *Sinai*, were not delivered to them as a Covenant of Works; and the Strength of the Argument lies here. If the *Sinai*-Dispensation had been a Covenant of Works (as the *Marrow* would have it) then there had been two opposite Covenants standing in Force upon the same Persons at the same Time, and in the same Circumstances; a Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham* and his Seed, and a Covenant of Works made with the *Jews* at *Sinai*. For, tho' they are not all *Israel*,
 who

who are of *Israel*, yet 'tis not imaginable, but many of those who witnessed the Promulgation of the Law, were even then Heirs of the Promise made to *Abraham*; and so (according to the *Marrow*) under both Covenants at the same Time. And how inconsistent this would have been with the Wisdom and Goodness of GOD, let any Body yet judge.

Epaphr. I think, Brother, we are like to find your Observation literally true, that some Men have a way of picking up Sentences out of Books, without any Regard to Connexion, or the Author's Scope, and make these their Sentiments; whereas, upon a full and impartial View of their Writings, they are found to be of a quite different Mind.

Epaphrod. We have a fresh Instance of this just now before us: For I am sure, the Author of the *Snake* was always of the Mind (as all Orthodox Divines are) that the two Covenants of Works and Grace are still standing, with Respect to Believers and Unbelievers. The whole Strain of his Paper run this Way, and is a continued Proof of it: Yet you see,
from

from Page 12 of the *Letter*, to 14, the Reverend *Prefacer*, by an Excess of Candour and Ingenuity, is pleased to bring him in, finding Fault with this Doctrine; and telling, That the Opinion of two Covenants standing at once, hath nothing to support it but its Novelty.

Epaphr. This last Reflection is visibly as unjust and unfair, as the former, as the Words of the *Snake*, Page 20, to which it refers, will make evident, which are,
 ‘ I think, this Author, and his Followers
 ‘ had much better, with the Generality of
 ‘ Orthodox Divines, conceive of the *Sinai*
 ‘ Dispensation, as a thundering Law, ten-
 ‘ ding to convince Man of his Impotency
 ‘ and Sinfulness by Nature, of the Impossi-
 ‘ bility of Salvation by good Works; and
 ‘ therefore, of the absolute Necessity of an
 ‘ Interest in CHRIST and his Righteousness.
 ‘ And, 2^{dly}, That it is a standing Rule of
 ‘ Duty both towards God and Man, to the
 ‘ End of the World, than to maintain an
 ‘ Opinion that has nothing to support it but
 ‘ its Novelty”. So that it’s plain to any
 unbyass’d Person, that ’tis not the Opinion
 of two standing Covenants, which is said

to have nothing to support it but its Novelty, but the making the Ten Commandments delivered to the *Jews* on Mount *Sinai*, a Covenant of Works, which the Author of the *Marrow* does.

Epaphrod. The Reverend *Prefacer* seems to be very angry in his *Letter*, Page 14, with the Author of the *Snake*, 20, 21, for saying, *That the Representation Nomista makes of his Life*, Marrow, Page 85 to 92, is not so very fair nor candid, and bears *Infinuations* he does not love to animadvert on, and tells us very roundly, *As to our Antagonist's Censure of the Account Nomista gave of his Life*, he had written some Notes about it, which he passes from. But a just View will make it plain to any discerning Person, that our Critick understood not the Story.

Epaphr. The Learned World is certainly at a Loss, by the *Prefacer's* keeping up his Notes upon this Part of the *Marrow*; the publishing of them would have added to the Merit of that elaborate Performance, *The Explication of Passages*, &c. and particularly served the Author of the *Snake*, as a Key to let him in to this dark and mysterious Story. *Epaphr.*

Epaphrod. But what if these Notes had been as dark and intricate as the Story it self? Our Learned Critick would not have understood them: So that I think 'tis lucky for us, that we're oblig'd to jog on without them.

Epaphr. I am much of your Mind, Brother; and therefore, upon all Hazards, I'll venture to give a short Hint of the Story. *Nomista* then tells *Evan*, That having been born and brought up in a Country, where there was very little Preaching, he liv'd a long Time in Ignorance and Blindness, and yet thought his Condition good; but at last, by hearing a zealous and godly Minister in the City, he was convinc'd that his present Condition was not good; and therefore went to the same Minister, who advised him to frequent Sermons, keep the Sabbath, leave off swearing and lying, and idle Communication, and get good Books, particularly *Mr. Bolton's* Directions for comfortably walking with God, *Mr. Brinsley's* True Watch, and such like. Now, in Pursuance of this Advice, he tells us, He yielded such Obedience to both Tables of

the Law, that every Body thought well of him; but then considering that this Obedience had not as yet exceeded that of the Scribes and Pharisees, he falls more closely to Work, and labours to force his Soul to every Duty, and to take notice of the inward Corruptions of his Heart, in Order to mortify and subdue them; and so he goes on comfortably, till he considered, That the Law of GOD required passive, as well as active Obedience; and then he endeavoured to submit himself quietly to the Will of God in every Condition, till he considered those Jews, of whom the Lord complains, *Isai. 58.* which made him fear he was not as yet right. Upon which, he goes to another Minister, who told him, his Condition was much better than that of those Jews: For they were but Hypocrites, and served not God with all their Hearts, as he did. Upon which he goes home contentedly, till the Thoughts of original Sin, occasioned new Disquiet to him. And then he goes to a third Minister of God's holy Word, who cheers him up, bidding him be of good Comfort; for tho' his Obedience, since his Conversion would not satisfy for his former Sins, yet in as much as,

at

at his Conversion he had confessed and forsaken them, God, according to his rich Mercy, and Promise, had pardoned and forgiven them. Whereupon he goes to his House again, and heightens his Obedience, till growing better acquainted with the Spirituality of the Law, he found, that still he transgressed in many Things; and therefore feared Hell and Damnation, which brings him to this last Minister a second Time, who tells him, Do not fear, for the best of Christians have their Failings, and no Man keepeth the Law of God perfectly; and therefore go on, and do as you have done, in striving to keep the Law perfectly, and in what you cannot do, God will accept the Will for the Deed: And wherein you come short, Christ will help you out.

Epaphrod. You have hit, I think, upon the great Lines of the Story; and there seems to be nothing in it beyond ordinary Comprehension. This Man indeed, according to the Account that's made of him, went great lengths upon a legal Foot: Yet for any Thing I know, he never prophesied, cast out Devils, or did many wonderful Works; which he might have
done

done, and yet got that Sentence pronounced upon him, *Matth. 7. 23. Depart from me, for I know you not.* But this is not the Thing in Dispute betwixt us: What we are now enquiring into, is, Whether this Representation (such as it is) seems fair and candid, or not? And in my humble Opinion, it bears such visible Marks of Forgery, that no Man of tolerable Ingenuity can believe it. For to say that a Legalist conversed three godly zealous Gospel-Ministers successively, and the last of them twice, for the more Security: And that none of 'em ever had the Power, so much as to name a Covenant of Grace, or to speak of Christ, and the Way of Salvation through him, is a Thing I am perswaded has never happened, since Christianity was established in the World.

Epaphr. I think indeed this *Legalist*, according to the Account that's made of him, was yet more unlucky in the Ministers he conversed with, than the Man in the Preface to the *Marrow* was. For his Minister (tho' an ignorant and miserable Comforter) bade him repent, and ask **GOD** forgiveness of his Sins. But thir
godly

godly and zealous Non-conformists, they neither enjoin their Man to repent, nor believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, but to strive to keep the Law perfectly, which they all three certainly knew to be absolutely impossible.

Epaphrod. I incline to be charitable, but at the same Time, I must say, That the representing thir three Gospel Ministers in such a legal Dress, looks very like to the making Way for what *Antinomista* says of the Author of the *Marrow*, Pag. 96. 97. viz. *That I formerly perceived, and now also perceive, that you have more Knowledge of the Doctrine of free Grace, than many other Ministers in this City have; and to tell you the Truth, it was by your Means that I was first brought to renounce my own Righteousness, and to cleave only to the Righteousness of Christ Jesus.*

Epaphr. With the *Prefacer's* Leave, I am still of the Mind, that there's something of fulsom Flattery here; and this being done and publish'd by the Author of the *Marrow* himself, does not look like that Humility, and Self-denial the Gospel enjoins.

Epa-

Epaphrod. But says the *Prefacer*, Pag. 13: of the *Letter*, He conceals his Name, and owns himself to be a *Compiler*, which would carry the Praises to the Authors, from whom he borrowed.

Epaphr. With respect to the concealing of his Name, he does this no more, than the *Prefacer* himself doth, when he puts *J. H.* to the Frontispiece or Close of his *Missives*, which are as well known to the present Generation as his full Name, whatever Debates the Learned may raise about them, in the succeeding Ages of the World. And that useful Artifice, he owns himself to be a *Compiler*, is nothing to the Purpose here. For 'tis not as the *Compiler*, or Author of the *Marrow*, that the *Antinomian* commends him, but as a Preacher, and Minister of the City; and tho' in this Respect, he might have been a *Compiler* too; yet I hope the *Prefacer* will allow, he was accountable for more than *unfair Citation*.

Epaphrod. We have this Story, of the Author of the *Marrow's* being a *Compiler*, so frequently told us, as an Apology for all his Excursions, that I begin to think, a

Man's

Man's being a Compiler, is a sufficient Security to him against the Things we call *Heterodoxy*.

Epaphr. This is a most ridiculous Jest; and the first Apology of this kind I ever heard. For an Author's incorporating other Mens Sentiments with his own, plainly says, he adopts them, and that he is of their Mind, and consequently accountable for them.

Epaphrod. But in good Earnest, Is the Work a Collection, as the *Prefacer* would have us believe, *Explication of Passages*, Pag. 4. ?

Epaphr. Nothing like it. 'Tis a Conference, managed by four Hands, who act their Part by Turns. And tho' I don't incline to meddle much with the Citations in the *Marrow*, after what has happened to a learned *Principal*, with one of them; yet by a general Glance, I think they all refer to what *Evan.* says: So that there must be three Parts of four fathered upon the Author, as his own proper Fact and Deed. And with respect to the fourth, where he speaks himself, I don't believe the one Half of it is taken from Divines,

G

either

either of great or small Note ; so that it seems to be no more a Collection, than some of the *Prefacer's* own Works are.

Epaphrod. I am glad to find the *Prefacer*, Pag. 15. owning, That the Appellation of a Sinner, given by the Author of the *Marrow*, to the Lord Jesus, is harsh : And I am hopeful, that in due Time, he may come to see, that this Book is not so intirely complete and excellent as he imagined when it got his *Imprimatur* : Especially, when I reflect on what he tells the *Principal*, Pag. 6. of the Conference, That if he had arraigned it for seeming, or some real Inconsistencies, a Fault into which Compilers may readily fall, or Expressions not well cautioned, he would have had no Debate with him upon that Head.

Epaphr. But don't mistake it, Brother. Tho' the *Prefacer* owns the Term to be harsh, yet with the same Breath he tells us the Orthodox Meaning is abundantly manifest, throughout the whole Tenor of the *Marrow* : And the scriptural Expressions are not much softer, which declare, That he was made Sin, and a Curse for us, *2 Cor. 5. 20. Gal. 3. 13.*

Epa-

Epaphrod. I heartily wish the *Prefacer* had condescended upon some Places in the *Marrow*, where the Orthodox Meaning of this Appellation (as 'tis called) is manifest; for, I declare ingenuously, that I mind none of them.

Eppabr. If he would not think I were resuming my Magisterial Airs, I would tell him (with Concern of Soul) that to call Christ a Sinner, as the Author of the *Marrow* does, Pag. 108. is not only a harsh, but also *blasphemous* Expression, and absolutely incapable of an Orthodox Meaning, unless he allow the *Antinomian* Opinion, to be such, viz. That God did not only impute the Guilt, and lay the Punishment of the Sins of the Elect upon Christ, but he laid upon him all the very Sins themselves; and that as to their real Filthiness and Loathsomeness; yea so, that Christ was really the Blasphemer, Murderer and Sinner, and so accounted by the Father. And to say that these Expressions, He was made Sin and a Curse for us, are not much softer, is a manifest perverting of the holy Scriptures, they visibly imply a Substitution, and their plain Meaning is, That our

G 2

Sins,

Sins, as to their Guilt, and Obligation to Punishment, were laid upon Christ, that he was a Sacrifice for them, who himself was sinless, and suffered a painful, ignominious, nay, an accursed Death, in our Room and Stead. And was it not Condescension enough that he agreed to be thus treated as a Sinner, tho' our new lighted *Meteors* do not load him with Sin it self?

Epaphrod. How know you an *Arminian* from one of another Principle.

Epaphr. I know him distinctly, by his maintaining universal Redemption, Free-Will, &c.

Epaphrod. You are intirely out of the Story; for the Author of the *Marrow* maintains, That Christ took upon him the Sins of all Men, Page 108, and that he died for every Man to whom the Gospel is preached, Page 120; and yet the Prefacer, Page 15 of his Letter, will not allow this to look like *Arminianism*; but says, 'Tis ill concluded from the Universality of Expression; and at this rate, the Scriptures might be concluded to be downright *Arminian*; for we want not Store of *Universalisms* there,

there, As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive, 1 Cor. 15. 22. He is the Propitiation for the Sins of the whole World. 1 John 2. 2. Now, vindicate the sacred Text, says he, from the Arminian Gloss, and with the same Labour you clear the Marrow.

Epaphr. If you please, for once, we'll take the *Prefacer's* Advice, and try if we can clear thir two sacred Texts from the *Arminian Gloss*; and I am hopeful it will be very easily done. For with Respect to the first of them, 'tis obvious, the Apostle means no more, than as in the first *Adam*, all Men that were in him, became liable to temporal and eternal Death: So in Christ, that is, through the Merits of his Death and Sufferings, all who are given to him, and by Faith implanted in him, are not only spiritually made alive (*being passed from Death to life*, 1 John 3. 14) but shall be raised from the Dead unto eternal Life. But that the *all* here mentioned, is no more than all Believers, appears, not only from the Term *in Christ* in this Verse, but from the whole following Discourse, which is only concerning the

the Resurrection of Believers unto Life: And with Respect to the other Text, the Apostle having told us in the 1st Verse, *That if any Man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous,* by adding these Words, *He is the Propitiation, &c.* shews, That our LORD grounds his Intercession for Pardon of Sin to penitent Believers, upon his having made Atonement for them before: Nor is his Undertaking herein limited to any select Persons among Believers, but he must be understood to be an Advocate for all for whom he is effectually a Propitiation, *i. e.* for all, who truly believe in him all the World over.

Epaprod. You have not gone further, I see, than *Pool's* Notes, for making up your Commentary, to which the *Prefacer* cannot miss ready Access. And yet, if you have not been guilty of unfair Citation, you are absolutely secure; for 'tis generally believed, that this Work was continued and published by Divines of great Note.

Epaphr. I fancy this is new Work to you, Brother, to vindicate the Scriptures from

from the *Arminian* Gloss, to a *Presbyteri-
ann* Minister; and yet I am afraid, the
Shift you have made this Way, will not
clear the Author of the *Marrow*, as the
Prefacer affirmed, it would.

Epaphrod. Very far from it; for though
the Scriptures, as you see, restrict the Ex-
tent of CHRIST'S Death to the Elect, who
were given to him in the Covenant of Re-
demption; yet the Author of the *Mar-
row* plainly extends it to all. Go, preach
the Gospel unto every Creature under Hea-
ven. That is, says he, Go and tell every
Man, without Exception, that here is
good News for him, Christ is dead for him,
&c. Now, with what Conscience any
Minister (if he is not *Arminian*, and be-
lieves an universal Redemption) can assure
every Man who hears him, that CHRIST
died for him, is what I do not see; and if
any of the Reverend Prefacer's reserved
Notes respect this Head, I should reckon it
a Favour to have the Opportunity of pe-
rusing them.

Epaphr. You remember, no doubt, the
Author of the *Marrow* says, Page 108,
*That by Christ's Satisfaction, all true Be-
lievers,*

• *lievers are acquitted from their Sins, both
 past, present, and to come; and Page 111,
 as Christ was justified at his Resurrection,
 and acquitted from all the Sins of all Be-
 lievers, by GOD the Father, as having
 now fully satisfied for them; even so were
 they. Upon which the Author of the
 Snake makes this Remark, That 'tis true
 indeed, Christ's Satisfaction to Divine Ju-
 stice, in the Room and Stead of Believers;
 being of infinite Value, they must be funda-
 mentally and virtually freed from all the
 Clags and Claims the Law has against them.
 But to say, That they are actually acquitted,
 especially (as this Author enlarges upon it)
 I fear, savours a little Antinomianism.
 The Way, says he, I always conceived of
 the Application of Christ's Righteousness and
 Merit, was, That a true Believer, upon
 his embracing Christ by Faith, had all his
 Sins, both past and present, remitted to
 him, and he actually acquit of them: And
 with Respect unto these, he should happen
 to be guilty of for the Future, That upon his
 renewed Repentance, and Application of the
 Blood of Christ, these are remitted and par-
 doned too; and so on, till he be without Spot
 or Wrinkle, or any such Thing. Epä-*

Epaphrod. But says the *Prefacer*, Page 16 of the *Letter*, That by *Christ's Satisfaction*, all true Believers are acquitted from their Sins, both past, present, and to come, is just what the Spirit of God asserts plainly, viz. There's no Condemnation to them who are in *Christ Jesus*, Rom. 8. 1.

Epaphr. When the Author of the *Snake* says, That Believers, by virtue of *Christ's Satisfaction*, are fundamentally and virtually freed from all the Clags and Claims the Law has against them; 'tis plain, he believes they can never actually be condemned, and that Justification, and eternal Life, is their sure Portion. But at the same Time, he is of Opinion, that even after they are in a justified State, there is still Matter of Condemnation in them, of which they are never actually acquitted, till they renew their Repentance and Application to the Blood of *Christ*. For, to believe that the Sins even of justified Persons are actually pardoned, before they are committed, and that the Guilt of them is removed before it be contracted, as the *Marrow* and its *Prefacer* would have him do; is, what he

H sincerley

sincerely declares, will not believe for him.

Epaphrod. I am indeed, of the Mind that the Hinge of this Controversy turns upon these two Points. *1mo*, Whether Believers were all actually justified at Christ's Resurrection, as the Author of the *Marrow* seems to maintain: And *2do*, Whether GOD continues to forgive the Sins of those who are justified; and if it shall be found that he does continue to pardon justified Persons. (as I hope it may) it will thereby evidently appear, That, upon Christ's Satisfaction, they are not actually acquitted from their Sins, both past, present, and to come. With respect then to the first of these Propositions, it has been so fully disproved, by those who have wrote against the *Antinomian* Scheme, that there remains little for me, but to mind the Reverend *Prefacer* of a Passage in the *Confession of Faith*, which he'll find in the *II*, Chap. §. 4. *God did from all Eternity decree, to justify all the Elect, and Christ did in the Fulness of time die for their Sins, and rise again for their Justification; nevertheless they are not justified, until the holy Spirit*

Spirit doth in due time, actually apply Christ to them. And none can read the Assembly's Lesser Catechism, but will see that the Time the Spirit applys Christ, is in our Effectual Calling: Nay, the Scriptures tell us plainly, GOD justifies none, but whom he calleth, Rom. 8. 30. and the learned Doctor Owen, in his Treatise of Justification, Page 305, says, Notwithstanding the full, plenary Satisfaction of Christ; yet all Men continue equally to be born by Nature, Children of Wrath; and whilst they believe not, the Wrath of God abideth on them; they are obnoxious unto, and under the Curse of the Law, &c. The Scriptures expressly declare, the Elect, before they are effectually called, to be Children of wrath Ephes. 2. 2, 3. and the Gospel Benefits imply, That there is a Time when we are actually guilty, and miserable; for there could be no Forgiveness, if we were not guilty. Rom. 4. 7, and yet according to this Doctrine, 'tis impossible to conceive how Believers at any Time of their Life, could be either guilty or miserable for these 1687 Years bygone. And with respect to the other

Proposition, viz. That GOD continues to forgive the Sins of those who are justified; 'tis the very words of the *Confession of Faith*; Chap. 11. §. 5. and Chap. 15. §. 16. 'tis said, *Every Man is bound to make private Confession of his Sins unto GOD, praying for the Pardon thereof; upon which and the forsaking of them, he shall find Mercy.* And indeed 'tis plain, all Sins are not pardoned at once. To say nothing, how impossible it is, I believe Christ would never taught his own People, to pray daily for Pardon, if they did not need it, and it could not be repeted, *Math. 6. 12, Forgive us our debts.* How oft do we find the Servants of GOD, renew their Prayers for Remission? They sometimes beg, GOD, would blot out Sin as a Debt *Psal. 51. 9, wash it away as a Stain*; remit it as a Fault, remember it not as a Crime, binding to punishment. The Church complains, *We have rebelled and thou hast not pardoned.* *Lam. 3. 42*, so, *Job. 7. 21*, Now, all these Prayers and Complaints, were absolutely needless and impertinent, if Believers were actually acquit of all their Sins, both past, present and

and to come, at Christ's Resurrection, as the *Marrow* asserts. And let the *Prefacer* be never so ill pleased with these dismal Consequences, he says the Author of the *Snake* drags from this plain *scriptural Doctrine* (as its called) yet I am sure, they are all fully as Native and Charitable, as to conclude a Man *Socinian*, from his thinking, that the Covenant of Redemption, has more of Affinity, to the Covenant of Grace (tho' they differ) than to that of Works. But, to all the drag'd and dismal Consequences of this Doctrine in the *Snake*, I'll venture at this Time to add one more, viz. If, by Christ's Satisfaction, Believers are acquitted of all their Sins, both past, present, and to come: Then, upon all hazards I say, it follows, That GOD can see no Sin in Believers, as the *Antinomians* maintain. And how much this may endear the Doctrine of the *Marrow* to some People, I shall not say. However, *Turretin* tells us *Instit. Theol. Par. 2. Page 650*, That a Believer falling into gross Crimes, incurreth the fatherly Indignation of GOD, loseth a present Meetness for Glory, and contracts damning Guilt.

Guilt: So that if he remain impenitent in that State, he ought to conclude himself liable to death, and certain to perish, except he repent. Rolls against Sherlock Page 60. 61. says, An Elect believing and heretofore justified Sinner may be said to have all Sins pardoned virtually and in subjecto, yet may some of his Sins be said not to be actually pardoned, seeing it is a real Truth, that to suppose a Believer might live and die without renewed Faith and Repentance, after the Commission of some great and deliberate Sin, were to suppose he might be damned. The Pious and Learned Mr. Durham in his Commentary upon the Revelation, Glasgow Edit. Page 223, in Answer to that Question, How can a Man at the first exercising of Faith, be said to be justified or pardoned of all his Sins, seeing his Sins after Justification, are not pardoned till they be committed and repented of? Affirms both are true: For, future Sins, lays he, are not actually pardoned, till they be committed and repented of; yet is the Man a justified Person, and in a justified Estate, having a Ground laid in Justification, for obtaining the Pardon

Par
tha
solu
fully
And
554
a S
com
or
med
Chr
spec
fall
by r
the
ousn
Am
Dick
511
Ann
this
cont
and
liver
left
vine
and

Pardon of those Sins that follow: So that they shall not overturn his former Absolution; for GOD's Covenant hath both fully in it, yet in due way to be applied. And Flavel, Edinburgh Edit. 1701 Page 554 says, As soon as we are received into a State of Justification, all Sins already committed are remitted, without Exception or Revocation; and not only so, but a Remedy is given us in the Righteousness of Christ, against Sin to come; and tho' these special and particular Sins we afterward fall into, do need particular Pardons: Yet, by renewed Acts of Faith and Repentance, the Believer applies to himself the Righteousness of Christ, and they are pardoned. Amesi^{us} in Cap. de Justif. Sect. 24. Mr. Dickson in his Therap Sacra Page 510. 511, and the Continuator of Mr. Pools Annotations upon the Places, relating to this Subject are all of the mind, that GOD continues to pardon the Sins of Believers, and consequently, that the Doctrine delivered on this Head in the Snake, (at least so far as the Testimony of thir Divines of great Note goes) is Orthodox, and sound, and the contrary Opinion, main-

maintained by the *Marrow*, and its *Prefacer*, is false and erroneous.

Epaphr. Don't you think, Brother, that the Author of the *Marrow*, goes a little too near the *Antinomian Dialect*; Page 126, 127, where he says, *Those who are married unto Christ, are as a acceptable unto GOD the Father, as Christ himself, according unto that of the Apostle Eph. 1. 6. He hath made us acceptable in the Beloved. Wherefore, if you would be acceptable unto GOD, then cleave unto his beloved Son, by Faith; and so shall the Love, and Favour of GOD be as deeply insinuated in you, as it is into Christ himself, and so shall GOD the Father, with his beloved Son, wholly possess you, and be possessed of you: And so GOD and Christ, and you shall become one entire Thing, according to Christ's Prayer. John 17. 21. &c.*

Epaphrod. I shall not say, but these, and such like Passages which frequently occur in the *Marrow*, are capable of an Orthodox Meaning: Yet to me it seems a little arrogant, for a redeemed Sinner, to say, That he is as acceptable unto GOD; as he that paid the Ransom:

Or,

Or, a pardoned Worm, to say, That he has as much of GOD's Love, and Affection, as his only begotten and eternally beloved Son has, who merited his Pardon: But it seems yet a higher Degree of Arrogance, to pretend to CHRIST's Privilege to be *One* with the *Father*. 'Tis true indeed, our Blessed LORD, in the forecited Text, prays most affectionately, That all who were given to him in the Covenant of Redemption, may be made one in Faith, brotherly Love and Practice, that thereby the World might be gained to Christianity; but that he still reserved GOD's Supremacy to himself, and his own Peculiar, as a Redeemer, is obvious to all sober Christians,

Epaphr. I am of the mind, the Author of the *Marrow*, Pag. 144, 145. and generally thro' his Book, speaks of the Union betwixt CHRIST and Believers, as if it intierred a real Change of Person betwixt him and them. I still forbear to repete his Expressions; because I would fain think, he meant better than many of his Words do import. For my own Part, the Notion I always framed to myself

self of this blessed Union, was, That upon our believing in CHRIST, we are made Partakers of all Gospel Benefits; we are related unto Christ, for all the Advantages, the Metaphors of this Union, express in Scripture: He loveth, enricheth, and honoureth us as a Man doth his Wife, He directs rules and quickens us as a Head doth the Members; he ministers Grace for Fruit and Holiness, as the Root doth to the Branches. And this Union he keeps undissolved: Nay more, the same Spirit which he received without Measure, abideth, and worketh a Conformity to the holy Life of CHRIST, in all his Members, which at last will be perfected to their outmost Capacity; but yet must be ware of thinking we are deified with GOD, or christified (so to speak) with CHRIST, or one natural Person with him, as if he had a Super-angelick Nature, which was a Sort of a common Soul to Believers; or that their distinct Personality shall ever cease; this would destroy all Notions of Government, and infer a pure Equality betwixt them, who infinitely differ.

Epa.

Epaphrod. But says the Prefacer, Page, 18 of the Letter, *The Scriptural Accounts of the mystical Union which is betwixt Christ and Believers, are more pathetical than this Comment can import. viz. 1 Cor. 6, 17. John. 17, 21. These high Expressions, go much beyond our Antagonist's jejune Commentary; and yet they import not any Thing unsuitable to the State of Creatures, yea, and of Sinful Creatures: His Exposition renders that Union scarce, if at all Mystical, seeing he placeth it mainly in the Effects, which presuppose the Mystery, and do not constitute it, &c.*

Epaphr. I differ extremly from the Reverend Prefacer; and must say, That I think every Part of this Commentary (such as it is) supposes the Union betwixt Christ and Believers, to be spiritual and mystical: and when taken complexly, seems to come near the genuine Meaning of 1 Cor. 6. 17. and John. 17. 21. Unless he say that GOD and CHRIST, and Believers, being one intire Thing, they must be essentially united. But how one of the most indefatigable Writers of the Age, could meet with a jejune Com-

I 2

ment,

ment, or such a weighty Subject, as that of Union with Christ is, and yet not either formally disprove it, or give us a better one of his own, is what I do not so well understand.

Epaphrod. There's no Mystery here, for though the reverend *Prefacer* be an Author of very great Application: Yet, besides his ordinary work of writting *Mis-sives*, *Diarys*, *Journals*, &c. he has of late given himself an additional Task of explaining Passages excepted against in the *Marrow*; and these multiply so fast upon him, that it cannot be expected he should answer every Demand. Besides, it would scarce look like a wise Manager, to throw away his Talents upon a *Snake*, when they may be more profitably and honourably entrusted with a very reverend and learned *Principal*, who will be sure to return them with Interest.

Epaphr. I had forgot almost to account for the Remark, Page. 24. of the *Snake*. founded upon an Expression in the *Marrow*, Page 110 viz. *For as being in Adam, and one with him, all did in him and with him transgress the Commandment*
of

of GOD: even so in Respect of Faith, whereby Believers are ingrafted into Christ, and spiritually made one with him, they did all in him and with him satisfy the Justice of GOD. Now, tho' the Author of the *Marrow*, speaks very Orthodoxly upon this Subject in the Context as the *Prefacer* observes, Page 17. Yet seeing through his Book, he seems to go in with the *Antinomian* Principle, That Believers are as completely Righteous as Christ is; and consequently must suppose that his Righteousness is theirs, not by Imputation, but essential Transfusion, and subjective Inhesion; and this looking like an Evidence of it, that he asserts, *They have satisfied the justice of GOD with Christ*: That is (as I took it) in Conjunction with him, the Author of the *Snake* could hardly miss to infer Absurdities from this odd Doctrine.

Epaphrod. However, Brother, upon second Thoughts, I am of the Mind, we should compound this Matter with the *Prefacer*: And the rather, that he says our Consequences have a great deal of Malignity in them. For, if we once hap-
pen,

pen, to come under the Suspicion of being *Malignants*; we must infallibly take the *Abjuration Oath*, and our qualifying, will cost us more than we are like to make by the *Remark*.

Epaphr. We come next to account for the *Remark* on the Appendix to the *Marrow*; and to make our Work the more easy, the, *Prefacer* tells us, Page 19 of the *Letter*, this Matter was considered in the *Explication of Passages*, &c.

Epaphrod. I am afraid our old Master's Memory begins to fail him, with the vast Burden of Passages &c. it bears; For its obvious to any Man of common Sense, who compares Page 42. and 43. of the *Snake* with 21. and 22. of the *Explication*, &c. That this Matter is not considered, in that renowned *Missive*, unless a forced and uncertain classing of some Scriptures be taken for it.

Epaphr. Whether it be considered or not, I hope you will not refuse, but the *Prefacer* had very good Reason for reviewing this *Remark*; seeing (as he says) the Author of it gives a wrong Account of the Gospel.

Epa.

(71)

Epaphrod. The *Prefacer* would not have acted like himself, if he had reserved his Notes here. But in the mean Time, I shall be heartily sorry, if the Author of the *Snake*, has made a wrong Account of the glorious Gospel of Christ Jesus. And in my Opinion, the best way to make a Discovery upon this important Subject, will be to follow the Method just now laid down to us, *viz.* to review the Appendix to the *Marrow*, the Remark upon it; and then the Account the *Prefacer* makes of both, with respect to the Appendix, the Title of which is, *The Difference betwixt the Law, and the Gospel.* Which the Author says, he intends to shew unto himself, and others who shall read it, for the Reasons he subjoins, *Page 263. and 264,* where, for our better Instruction in the Point, we have a Description of the Law and Gospel. The last of which is said to be, *A Doctrine revealed from Heaven, by the Son of GOD, presently after the Fall of Mankind into Sin and Death; and afterwards manifested more clearly and fully to the Patriarchs, and Prophets, to the Evangelists,*

gelists and Apostles, and by them spread
 abroad to others, wherein, Freedom from
 Sin, the Curse of the Law, the Wrath of
 GOD, Death and Hell is freely promised,
 for Christ's Sake unto all those, who truly
 believe on his Name. That is, who are
 verily perswaded, in their Hearts, that
 Christ is theirs, that they shall have Life
 and Salvation by him; and that whatlo-
 ever Christ did, for the Redemption of
 Mankind, he did it for them. 2dly, We
 are to consider the Nature and Office of
 the Law, which is to shew unto us our
 Sin. Rom. 3. 20. Our Condemnation, and
 Death Rom. 2. 1. But the Nature and
 Office of the Gospel is to shew unto us,
 that Christ hath taken away our Sin John
 1. 29. and he that is our Redemption, and
 Life Col. 1. 14. 3dly, We are to con-
 sider where we may find the Law-writ-
 ten and where we may find the Gospel
 written: And we are not to think, that
 these two Doctrines are to be distinguished,
 by the Books and Leaves of the Scriptures,
 but by the Diversity of the Spirit speaking
 in them: As for Example, where Christ
 thus Preacheth, Blessed are the pure in
 heart

heart, for they shall see God, Mat. 5. 8. Except ye be converted, and become as little Children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, Mat. 18. 3. He that doth the Will of my Father which is in Heaven, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, Matth. 7. 21. And again, the Parable of the wicked Servant cast into Prison for not forgiving his Fellow, Mat. 18. 30. The casting of the rich Glutton into Hell, Luke 16. 23. And again, He that denieth me before Men, I will deny him before my Father which is in Heaven, Luke 12. 9. with divers such other Places: All which, I say, do appertain to the Doctrine of the Law. 4thly, We are to take heed that we do not take the Gospel for the Law, nor the Law for the Gospel: And if we would know when the Law speaketh, and when the Gospel speaketh, let us take this for a Note; That when in Scripture, there is any moral Work commanded to be done, either for eschewing of Punishment, or upon Promise of any Reward temporal or eternal, or else, when any Promise is made, with Condition of any Work to be done, which is commanded

in the Law, there is to be understood the Voice of the Law. Contrariwise, Where the promise of Life and Salvation is offered unto us freely, without any Condition of any Law, either natural or moral, or any Work done by us: All those Places where we read them in the old Testament, or in the new, are to be referred to the Voice and Doctrine of the Gospel.

Epaphr. I am still afraid this Doctrine has some little Tang of *Antinomianism*; for all along I was expecting to have heard something like Precepts, and Threarnings; in a full and enlarged Description of the Gospel, agreeably to *Acts* 16. 31. *Mark* 1. 14, 15. 2 *Cor.* 9. 13. *Mark* 16. 15, 16. *Luke* 13. 3. 5. *John* 3. 36. 2 *Thess.* 1. 8. 1 *Pet.* 4. 17. *Heb.* 2. 3. But to my very great Surprize, I am told, the Gospel has no Condition, contains no Law, nor requires any Work to be done by us, in Order to obtain Heaven and eternal Life: Any thing of this Kind must be understood to be the Voice of the Law. And therefore, I heartily go in with the Remark in the *Snake*, viz. The Gospel Constitution visibly contains Promises and Threat-

Threatnings, which affect all of us as a Rule of Happiness and Misery; and most of the Promises of the Bible, that refer to the State of Souls, are Evangelical. They cannot be the Sanction of the Covenant of Works, which promised Life to nothing below sinless and perfect Obedience. 2dly, The Threatnings of the Covenant of Innocency, admitted no Repentance or After-relief to the Guilty; they fixed the Curse irrevocably, in Case of any Transgression. 3dly, No Overture of Life, or Door of Hope, or Argument to Conversion, with Hopes of Acceptance, could be framed out of those legal Threats or Promises to any Man that is a Sinner. *Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die, O House of Israel?* was not the Language of that Covenant: No, if a Man was once a Sinner, the Law could speak no lower to him than this, *Thou art undone, Man, for ever, whether thou turn or not.* Things being thus, will ye consider all the Calls of God in Christ to Man since the Fall: Weigh the Promises and Threats wherewith God strengthens these Calls: See if any one of the Calls to Faith or Repentance,

pentance, or Holiness, thus backed with Repentance, Promise and Threatnings, be not Evangelical. 1st, Doth God in these Calls promise nothing below sinless perfect Obedience? 2^{dly}, Do the Threats annexed to those Calls exclude all After-repentance? See Ezek. 18. 21. Is that Gospel or not? *But if the Wicked will turn from all his Sins that he hath committed, &c. he shall surely live, his Transgression shall not be remembered.* 3^{dly}, Are not those Calls, with the Promises and Threats, directed to Sinners for their Conversion and Recovery? Is it not to Sinners, God speaks in them? Are not the Promises an Offer of Relief? Are not the Threatnings intended to awe and warn Sinners against Refusal of these Offers? They are not uttered to bind the Curse, but to deliver from it, by urging our Compliance with the Commands of a Redeemer. *To day if you will hear his Voice, harden not your Hearts as in the Provocation, &c. Heb. 3. 7, 8. and 4. 7.* Every Threatning used by God, as an Argument to Conversion, is a Gospel Threatning. But, if this Man's Opinion hold, the preaching the Necessity of Conversion

version of Holiness and Sanctification, must be legal Preaching, though Christ and his Apostles spent most of their Time in preaching those Doctrines, and enforced them with the most strong and powerful Arguments imaginable, both by way of Promise and Threatning. In a Word, I wonder what kind of a King this Man and his Followers would make Christ to be? Or, what kind of a Government they would assign to him in the World, if there be no Sanction to his Precepts, and Obedience and Disobedience, an indifferent Thing as to Happiness and Misery? At this Rate, the great King, and Head of the Christian Church, should have but a very precarious Dominion of it, if he had neither Rewards nor Punishments to induce Mens Regards to his Authority. Read the Scriptures, or wait the Day of Judgment, and you'll find it otherwise.

Epaphrod. How does the *Prefacer* get over the Evidence of this Remark.

Epaphr. By one of the most cunning Stratagems imaginable; for having first curtail'd the Passage excepted against in the *Appendix*, as not being safe in a full Light,

Light, to make up the Deficiency here, he travels four or five Pages forwards in the Book, till he finds an Inference to his Mind, drawn from the general Account made of the Gospel, in the Beginning of the *Appendix*. And this, he very honestly tacks to, and incorporates with so much of the excepted Pallage, as he thought fit to expose, and then reasons to very great Advantage upon it: Tho' 'tis plain the Author of the *Snake* never had it under Consideration, further than by citing these precise Words, Pag. 272. *He must not so much as let it (viz. The Law) enter into his Mind or Cogitation.* Which happen to ly in the same Page.

Epaphrod. I am of Opinion, such a Way of doing Things, is no great Evidence of a good Cause, nor are such Methods for propagating of it, like to take with honest Men.

Epaphr. But you must mind, Brother, that the *Prefacer* says, Pag. 20. *The Words more directly censured by our Antagonist, Pag. 42. carry nothing in the least, prejudicial to the closest and sweetest Obligation unto Obedience, which the Law layeth*

layeth upon us, and whereunto we only can be raised by Faith, in the Exercise whereof Virtue is derived from the Lord Jesus, the Fountain of Life, for that Effect.

Epaphrod. With all Respect unto the Prefacer's great Learning, the Question is not about Obligations to Obedience, taken from the Law, but from the Gospel: Or in plain Scots, Whether the Gospel be no more than a Promise of Life and Salvation freely offered to us, without any Condition of any Law, natural, ceremonial or moral; or any Work done by us, as the *Marrow* asserts, Pag. 268. Or rather, if Christ be not a Legislator, the Gospel a Law, containing Precepts, Promises and Threatnings, as appears from *Isai.* 33. 22. *Rom.* 3. 27. *Matth.* 23. 20. And the Answer of the *Larger Catechism*, to that Question concerning Christ's Kingly Office. The same Account of the Gospel is likewise manifest from the third and fourth Warrands to believe in the brief Sum of Christian Doctrine, which, tho' it has not the same Authority with the *Confession of Faith*, yet was certainly compiled by
Divines

Divines of great Note. 'Tis plain too from the Scriptures above cited, Pag. and from the *Remark* in the *Snake*; which Documents, the *Prefacer*, if he pleases, may disprove at his Leisure.

Epaphr. The *Prefacer* has told us already, Pag. 20. That our Antagonist's Cenſure of the forecited Words in the *Marrow*, from Pag. 43 to 46 inclusive, bears, *That instead of perfect Obedience required by the Law, as the Condition of Life, sincere Obedience is substitute by the Gospel.*

Epaphrod. I mind the Charge exactly, and the Way he instructs it is, 1. By asserting, *That, unless the Author of the Snake say so, he contradicts not the Marrow.*

Epaphr. I think this a little hard; for when the *Marrow* says, *The Gospel contains neither Condition, Law, nor Work done by us: And the Snake says, It contains all the three; this makes a visible Contradiction, and yet I hope this does not infer, that sincere Obedience is substitute by the Gospel, instead of perfect Obedience required by the Law, as the Condition*

of

of Life, since it may be appointed as the Way and Means of a Believer's obtaining Salvation, tho' it be not the Cause or condition of it.

Epaphrod. But still the *Prefacer* seems to be very confident, that the Author of the *Snake* maintains, sincere Obedience is substitute by the Gospel, in lieu of perfect Obedience required by the Law; and avers he saith it really more than once in the forecited *Pag. 44*; for speaking of Promises and Threatnings contained in the Scriptures; he hath these Words, *Viz. They cannot be the Sanction of the Covenant of Works, which promised Life to nothing below sinless and perfect Obedience*: And near the Foot of the Page, with the Beginning of Page 45, speaking of the Calls to Faith or Repentance, or Holiness, back'd with Promises and Threatnings--- he hath these Words by way of argumentative Inquiry, *Doth God in these Calls, promise Life to nothing below sinless perfect Obedience? This must necessarily imply, that Life is promised to somewhat below sinless and perfect Obedience.*

Epaphr. I do not indeed understand this way of reasoning, 1st. To alledge, *That the Author of the Snake really says more than once* (which is a manifest Falshood) *That sincere Obedience is substitute by the Gospel, in stead of perfect Obedience required by the Law.* And yet, after all, to be visibly obliged to conclude his Opinion by way of Inference: This does not seem to be so very candid, and plainly looks like the seeking an Opportunity to quarrel.

Epaphrod. I am of the Mind the Reverend *Prefacer* has been a little hard put to it, when he was forced to use such Methods with a raw Writer, who has almost crept into the World by Stealth.

Epaphr. But what tho' the Author of the *Snake* had really said, That God has substitute, and accepts of Sincerity under the Gospel, instead of perfect Obedience. The Reverend Mr. *Brisbane* in his Sermon upon Rom. 6. 14. Pag. 14. would have given it his fresh Testimony, that in some Sense it may be admitted, viz. So far, that a Soul in Christ is not damned, tho' it do nothing in a full Conformity to the Law, Rom. 8. 1. And again says he, It may be admitted thus far, That the Lord is pleased, in a Way of Grace, graciously to reward the honest Aims of imperfect Believers; but this allennarly in the Way of Faith, putting them in the Hands of the great Angel of the Covenant: And then going up out of his golden Censer, with the Smoke of his Incense before the Throne; upon which Account only, they are graciously accepted and rewarded. And let the *Prefacer* think of it as he has a mind, 'tis the plain Opinion of all sober Christians, and Orthodox Divines, That Holiness, or sincere Obedience, is necessary to Salvation: He that made Faith necessary to Justification, hath made Obedience necessary to Salvation: He hath as well promised Heaven to the godly Man, as Pardon to the penitent Believer: And our Perseverance in Holiness, is as truly the Way
to

to Glory, as the Scriptures can describe it. 'Tis true, nothing we can do this Way, merits Heaven; but he that merited Heaven, hath peremptorily appointed these to bring us thither, and requires them as indispensable Duties and Qualifications, of all them he'll admit to the new *Jerusalem* that is above, *Heb.* 6, 10, 11, 12. *For God is not unrighteous to forget your Work, and Labour of Love, &c. And we desire that every one of you do shew the same Diligence, to the full Assurance of Hope, to the End, that ye be not slothful, but followers of them, who through Faith and Patience, inherit the Promises.* *Heb.* 12. 14. *Follow Peace with all Men, and Holiness, without which no Man shall see the Lord,* *Rom.* 8. 13. *If ye live after the Flesh, ye shall die; but if ye, through the Spirit, mortify the Deeds of the Body, ye shall live.* *Rev.* 22. 14. *Blessed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have a Right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in; for without are Dogs.* Now, these must be Gospel-promises, because Salvation is promised in them below Perfection; and yet, I hope, upon second Thoughts, the *Prefacer* will not reckon the two Covenants intirely confounded by them.

Epaphrod. Whatever Way we have done our Work, we have now got near an End on't; and tho' some of the most considerable Remarks in the *Snake*, be not considered in this Letter, but remitted to the Explication of *Passages*, &c. We shall resume no Debate about

them at this Time, but leave every Reader to judge, whether they be satisfyingly answered or not.

Epaphr. At this Rate we are like to end amicably; for I dare say, the Author of the *Snake* never projected a Victory in such an unequal Rencontre; but after wrestling out from the detestable Herd of *Societians*, and other Hereticks, with whom he was charitably classed, to give his *Testimony* (such as it is) in Favours of the *Doctrine of the Church of Scotland*, in the Faith and Belief whereof he was educated, and hopes to die.

Epaphrod. But, says the *Prefacer*, Page 22 of the *Letter*, *Had any written for the Marrow in so loose a Way, and with such Blindness, as this Author hath committed in his Attack against it, it might have been expected, he and his Work would have been brought under a condign Enquiry.*

Epaphr. When we are about to part for this Campaign, I'm heartily glad to find these gross and dangerous Errors the *Prefacer* undertook to demonstrate, the *Snake* contained, amount to no more than a loose Way of writing and blundering, which, I am hopeful, the Author may amend under the Inspection of such an exact and pointed Writer, as the Reverend *Prefacer* makes (if the severe Discipline he meets with, don't spoil his Education) and if he continue as long at the Trade of scribbling, as some others have done, and does not turn a little more polite, I am of Opinion, that he
should

should be condemned to write and transmit *Missives*, and nothing else, during Life.

Epaphrod. You know, the Reverend *Prefacer* concludes that elaborate Performance, *The Explication of Passages, &c.* with some plain *Queries* (as they are called) to the *Excepters* against the Marrow; and if the Author of the Snake intends to leave his loose and blundering way of writing, or show any thing of a Capacity to improve, he'll follow the Example of his Teacher.

Epaphr. Here they are then.

Query 1st, Whether every Minister of the Gospel be not obliged, as much as possible, to preserve the Peace and Unity of the Church?

Q. 2. Whether the reviving of an old *Sectarian Book*, which no sooner almost appeared in the World, but was quarrelled for *Antinomianism*, and still continues a Bone of Contention, be a probable Mean for that Effect?

Q. 3. Whether the Testimony of a few well meaning Women and Tradesmen, in Favours of this Book, be equal to the Declarations of whole Judicatories of the Church against it. Or in short, Whether common Laicks or Divines, best understand Matters of Controversy?

Q. 4. Whether some of these Declarations, particularly that of the Synod of *Fife*, be not so far binding upon the *Prefacer*, as to hinder him from writing in Favours of this Book?

Q. 5. Whether, when he speaks of Godly exercised Christians, that have reap'd Advantage by

by this Book; he means only some particular Persons, into whose Hands he himself has put it, or the whole Body of Ministers, and intelligent People through the Nation who have read it?

Q. 6. What kind of Christians these can be, who are still the more endeared to the *Marrow*, the more it is suspected of Errors, and some of them exposed to the World?

Q. 7. Whether a new Edition of the *Prefacer's* own Works in a clear, distinct and intelligible Stile, had not been as necessary, and as a probable Mean for advancing true Religion?

Q. 8. Whether the *Prefacer* was obliged to make an Essay this Way, before he meddled with Foreign Authors?

Q. 9. Whether keeping by the Scriptures, *Confession of Faith*, and *Directory*, be not as Probable a Mean for preserving Orthodox Principles, as going back to *Cromwel's* Time, for making up a new Creed?

Q. 10. Whether, when a Man composes a Book consisting partly of Citations from other Authors, visibly incorporate with his own Sentiments, be not equally obliged to account for their Orthodoxy, as he is for the fair and just quoting of them?

Q. 11. Whether the Author of the *Marrow* might not mistake, or misrepresent some of those learned and foreign Divines he cites, as well as the *Prefacer* has done the Poor *Snake* in plain *English*?

Q. 13.

Q. 13. Whether these great and eminent Divines, Confessors, Martyrs, renowned Witnesses and Reformers, cited in the *Marrow* were infallible or not?

Q. 14. If they were not infallible, Whether it be a Reformation Principle, to go in to all their Sentiments by an implicate Faith?

Q. 15. Whether I may not as well say, *Luther*, for Example, was in the wrong, for cursing the holy and just Law of God, tho' he did it in the Heat of his Heroick Performances for the Reformation? As that I do not believe his Doctrine about the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, nor admire his Conduct in retaining Images in the Church?

Q. 16. In the *Prefacer's* own Words, Whether these poor tossed Creatures, who have read this Book with so much Satisfaction, had *Luther, Walker, Ainsworth, Findal, Marshal, Preston, Culverwell, Cotton, Hooker*, and many others he cites by them, to consult? Or did they not rather look upon these Passages excepted against in the *Marrow*, as the Author's own Sentiments?

Q. 17. Whether the publishing and recommending this Book so warmly, be not in good Earnest, to toss poor Christians betwixt the received Doctrine of the Church, and a new Scheme?

Q. 18. Whether the Church of *Scotland* be in the wrong, for maintaining Doctrines contrary to these Authors cited in the *Marrow*?

Q. 19.

Q. 19. Or rather, Whether this Book has not been publish'd with a Design to blacken the received Doctrine of the Church, with which it is visibly inconsistent?

Q. 20. Whether this was good Service done to the Church, or those exercised unto Godliness, who formerly were perfectly well pleased with our Doctrine and Constitution?

Q. 21. Whether the Prefacer ever subscribed the Confession of Faith and Directory? Or if this be yet the Confession of his Faith?

Q. 22. Whether his Conscience, upon serious Reflection can tell him, he has answered these solemn Vows and Engagements he came under at his Ordination, particularly, that through the Tract of his Ministry, he has followed no divisive Course?

Q. 23. How the Publisher likes his own sweet Preface to the Marrow, considering, that upon second Thoughts, he himself has found several Inconsistencies, harsh and unguarded Expressions in this Book, and is like to have more discovered to him by several Hands through the Nation?

8 DE 59

*Jam satis humanis Erroribus addita monstra
Risimus; aut tales potius deservimus actus.*

C. Sedulii Carm. Paschal. Lib. 1.

F I N I S.